



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

88
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,891	01/06/2001	Arif A. Merchant	10004029-1	4110

7590 12/19/2003

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ZHEN, WEI Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/755,891	MERCHANT ET AL.	
	Examiner Wei Y Zhen	Art Unit 2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-48 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 13, 28, 31, 32, 35, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolby et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,630,025 in view of Deckers, U.S. Patent No. 6,650,961.

As per claim 1, Dolby et al discloses configuring a data storage system, using a high-level language description to configure the data storage system (col. 2 lines 30-34, col. 7 lines 25-42).

Dolby et al does not explicitly disclose the data storage system is a disk array.

However, Deckers discloses configuring a disk array (col. 2 lines 17-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Deckers into the teaching of Dolby et al to have the data storage system to be a disk array because one would want to be able to provide rapid data storage and retrieval and high levels of storage capacity.

As per claim 2, Dolby et al discloses the high level language specifies configuration goals (col. 4 lines 24-29).

As per claim 3, Dolby et al discloses the high level language description includes a declarative language (col. 4 lines 51-55).

As per claim 4, Dolby et al discloses the high-level language includes generic configuration commands (col. 4 lines 30-51).

Claim 13 is rejected for the reasons et forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 2.

As per claim 28, Dolby et al disclose high level language description specifies how data storage stores data (col. 8 lines 11-52).

Dolby et al does not explicitly disclose the data storage is a disk array.

Deckers discloses a disk array (col. 2 lines 17-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Deckers into the teaching of Dolby et al to have the data storage system to be a disk array because one would want to be able to provide rapid data storage and retrieval and high levels of storage capacity.

As per claim 31, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Dolby et al discloses a high-level language description (col. 2 lines 30-34). Dolby and Decks does not explicitly disclose descriptions includes RAID level, stripe size and cache page size. However, RAID level, stripe size and cache page size were well known description of disk array at the time the invention was made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the description to include RAID level, stripe size and cache page size because one would want to configure the disk array properly.

As per claim 32, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Dolby et al discloses generating a high level language description (col. 2 lines 30-34).

As per claims 35, 36, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated and further it is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claims 31, 32 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-10, 12, 14-24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33-34, 37-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolby et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,630,025 in view of Deckers, U.S. Patent No. 6,650,961 further in view of Motoyama et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,578,090.

As per claim 5, Dolby et al does not disclose explicitly the high-level language description includes device/host-independent commands.

However, Motoyama et al discloses the high-level language description includes device/host-independent commands (col. 2 lines 31-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Motoyama et al into the teaching of Dolby

et al to have the high-level language description includes device/host-independent commands. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide efficient method to use the description for various types of systems.

As per claim 6, Dolby et al does not disclose explicitly translating the high-level language description into device/host specific commands.

However, Motoyama et al discloses translating the high-level language description into device/host specific commands (col. 2 lines 31-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Motoyama et al into the teaching of Dolby et al to translate the high-level language description into device/host specific commands. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide efficient method to use the description for various types of systems.

Claim 7 is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

As per claim 8, Dolby et al does not disclose explicitly that the high-level language description is translated into device/host independent commands and the device/host independent commands are translated into device/host specific commands.

Official Notice is taken that the high-level language description is translated into device/host independent commands and the device/host independent commands are translated into device/host specific commands were well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of the well known knowledge into the system of Motoyama et al and Dolby et al to have the high-level language description be translated into device/host independent commands and the device/host independent commands be translated

into device/host specific commands. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide efficient method to use the generic device/host independent command for various types of systems.

Claim 9 is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

As per claim 10, Dolby et al does not explicitly disclose performing rule checking as claimed.

Official Notice is taken that performing rule checking was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of the well known knowledge into the system of Motoyama et al and Dolby et al to perform the rule checking. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide efficient method to ensure an correct and accurate configuration.

As per claim 12, Dolby et al does not explicitly disclose translating....into device specific queries, and generating commands from responses to the queries.

Official Notice is taken that translating....into device specific queries, and generating commands from responses to the queries was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of the well known knowledge into the system of Motoyama et al and Dolby et al to translate....into device specific queries, and generate commands from responses to the queries. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide efficient method to generate configuration commands that is tailored to meet the requirement of the specific system.

As per claim 14, Dolby et al and Motoyama et al do not explicitly disclose sending...to a host as claimed.

Official Notice is taken that sending...to a host as claimed was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of the well known knowledge into the system of Motoyama et al and Dolby et al to send...to a host as claimed. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be facilitates the communications between various types of systems.

Claim 15 is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

As per claim 16, Motoyama et al disclose executing the device/host specific commands to configure the data storage device (col. 2 lines 31-35, note that the machine language are inherently executed).

Claims 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26 are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejections of claims 11, 10, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12 respectively.

As per claim 19, Dolby et al disclose high level language description specifies how data storage stores data (col. 8 lines 11-52).

Dolby et al and Motoyama et al do not explicitly disclose a disk array.

Deckers discloses a disk array (col. 2 lines 17-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Deckers into the teaching of Dolby et al and Motoyama to have the data storage system to be a disk array because one would want to be able to provide rapid data storage and retrieval and high levels of storage capacity.

Claim 20 is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5 and further the configuration commands inherently used to set data storage parameters in the data storage system.

Claim 27 is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 6 and 20.

As per claim 29, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and further Motoyama et al disclose converting the specific commands into signals, and sending the signals to the disk array, whereby the signals cause the disk array to set parameters specified by the signal (col. 2 lines 31-35, note that signal inherently caused the disk array to be configured (cause the disk array to set parameters specified by the signal)).

As per claim 30, the rejection of claim 29 is incorporated and further Motoyama et al disclose performing a host configuration on the disk array (col. 2 lines 31-35, note that signal inherently caused the disk array to be configured).

Claims 33-34 are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claims 29-30 respectively.

Claim 37, 38, 39, 40 are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claims 29, 30, 31, 32 respectively.

Claims 41, 42, 43 are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claims 29, 31, 32 respectively.

Claims 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claims 7, 10, 11, 9, 26 respectively.

4. Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolby et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,630,025 in view of Deckers, U.S. Patent No. 6,650,961 further in view of Motoyama et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,578,090 and Lebee, U.S. Patent No. 6,108,744.

As per claim 11, Dolby et al, Deckers and Motoyama et al don't explicitly disclose specific commands are generated only for device/host parameter that should be changed.

However, Lebee disclose specific commands are generated only for device/host parameter that should be changed (col. 3 lines 45-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lebee into the system of Motoyama et al, Deckers, and Dolby et al to have specific commands be generated only for device/host parameter that should be changed. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide efficient method to reduce the times associated with generating host specific commands by reusing generic commands.

Claim 25 is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 11.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/21/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remark, applicant has argued that

1) Dolby et al do not disclose a disk array, nor do they teach or suggest how their system can be used to configure a disk array.

Response:

- 1) Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Decker is not cited to disclose the configuration of a disk array.

applicant has argued that

- 2) Montoyama et al do not teach a disk array, nor do they teach or suggest how Dolby et al system can be used to configure a disk array.

Response:

- 2) Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Decker is not cited to disclose the configuration of a disk array.

applicant has argued that

- 3) Neither Dolby et al nor Montoyama et al teach or disclose accessing a high level description that specifies how a data storage device store data.

Response:

- 3) Dolby et al clearly discloses configuring a data storage system (col. 8 lines 10-45, "the configurator contain a database called the knowledge base...the contents of the knowledge base..defines the type of constructor that may be manipulated by the configurator")

applicant has argued that

- 4) Neither Dolby et al nor Montoyama et al teach or suggest processing a high-level language description into configuration commands that can be used to set data storage parameters in a data storage system.

Response:

4) Dolby et al and Montoyama et al clearly disclose processing a high-level language description into configuration commands that can be used to set data storage parameters in a data storage system (see the rejection to claim 20 above).

applicant has argued that

5) Neither Dolby et al nor Montoyama et al teach or suggest translating a high-level language description into specific commands that can be used to set data storage parameters in a data storage device.

Response:

5) Dolby et al and Montoyama et al clearly disclose translating a high-level language description into specific commands that can be used to set data storage parameters in a data storage device (see the rejection to claim 27 above).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wei Y Zhen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0437. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Wei Zhen
Primary Examiner
12/15/2003

W. Y. Z.
WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER